

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/613,334	07/03/2003	Joseph Saladino	IOI-453	5122	
45488	7590 09/06/2006	09/06/2006 EXAMINER			
	S, MORGAN & AME	PREBILIC, PAUL B			
10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			3738		
			DATE MAILED: 09/06/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/613,334	SALADINO ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Paul B. Prebilic	3738				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply		0) 00 7,407, 400, 500,				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	Ilv 2006.					
	•					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-24 and 30-34</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-24 and 30-34</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
 Certified copies of the priority documents 						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)	,, 					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
raper No(s)/Mail Date	5) [

Application/Control Number: 10/613,334

Art Unit: 3738

Claim Objections

Claim 22 is objected to because of the following informalities:

On line 1 of claim 22, the language "provided in provided in" is redundant.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 21-24 and 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Rose et al (US 3,102,356) in view of or Fuchs (DE 20022306) or Hassler et al (US 6,997,958). Rose meets the claim language where the femoral head as claimed is met by the head (10) of Rose, the neck as claimed is neck (6), and at least one the spacer as claimed is stop ring(s) (a) of various thicknesses; see column 2, lines 37-42 and also see the disclosure of Figures 5 and 7 as well as column 1, line 55 to column 2, line 55. However, Rose fails to disclose a stem that is separate from the neck but is capable of being positioned in a bore in the neck via a taper fit as claimed.

Fuchs teaches that it was known to make detachable necks that can be attached to a stem portion; see the figure and the bottom of that figure that shows a taper fit opening for a stem. Similarly, Hassler teaches that it was known to make necks detachable from the stems and to fit via a taper lock therewith; see Figures 5 and 6.

Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to make the

neck of Rose detachable so that it could be fit to different stems to better adapt the invention to the particular patient; see MPEP 2144.04 V that is incorporated herein by reference.

With regard to claims 22-24 and 33-34, Rose fails to disclose the use of the particular sizes claimed or a plurality of them in the bore as claimed. However, since Rose teaches that it was contemplated to use stops of various thicknesses (see column 2, lines 37-43), it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to use stops of particular thicknesses or multiples of such stops in order to adapt the invention to the particular needs of the patient.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3738

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 of 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action if the application is not stored in image format (i.e. the IFW system) or published.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Paul B. Prebilic whose telephone number is (571) 272-4758. He can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Paul Prebilic Primary Examiner

Paul Retu

Art Unit 3738